Case 15-01015 Doc 60 Filed 02/20/15 Entered 02/20/15 17:26:02 Desc Main Document Page 1 of 2

	1	1	
Order Text:	UPON CONSIDERATION OF: 1) THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR CONTEMPT: 2) THE DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION; 3) THE PLAINTIFF'S REPLY; 4) THE EXHIBITS INTRODUCED AND TESTIMONY OF THE WITNESSES AT THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING HELD ON FEBRUARY 20, 2015; 5) THE COURT'S ORDER DATED JANUARY 30, 2015 WHICH ORDERED THE DEFENDANT TO IMMEDIATELY CEASE AND DESIST FROM PUBLISHING CERTAIN DISPARAGING INTERNET POSTINGS ABOUT THE PLAINTIFF AND OTHERS ("PROTECTED PARTIES"), AND TO " FORTHWITH TAKE ALL ACTIONS REASONABLY NECESSARY TO REMOVE OR TO CAUSE TO REMOVE" ALL DISPARAGING STATEMENTS ABOUT THE PROTECTED PARTIES FROM THE INTERNET OR OTHER PLATFORMS, THE COURT FINDS THAT THE DEFENDANT HAS FAILED TO COMPLY WITH THE ORDER IN SEVERAL RESPECTS AND IS IN CONTEMPT. FIRST, THE DEFENDANT DID NOT COMPLY WITH THE TEMPORAL ASPECT OF THE ORDER WHICH REQUIRED IMMEDIATE EFFORTS TO REMOVE THE OFFENDING STATEMENTS FROM THE INTERNET. HE DELAYED FOR 7 DAYS IN COMMENCING EFFORTS TO COMPLY WITH THE ORDER WITHOUT JUSTIFICATION OR EXCUSE. THE DEFENDANT'S INITIAL ATTEMPTS WERE INADEQUATE. INDEED, EX.1 VIOLATES THE CEASE AND DESIST ASPECTS OF THE ORDER AND IS NOT AN ADEQUATE ATTEMPT TO COMPLY WITH THE ORDER AND IS NOT AN ADEQUATE ATTEMPT TO COMPLY WITH THE ORDER AND IS NOT AN ADEQUATE ATTEMPT TO COMPLY WITH THE ORDER AND IS NOT AN ADEQUATE. ATTEMPT TO COMPLY WITH THE ORDER ALTHOUGH THE DEFENDANT DID ATTEMPT TO COMPLY DID NOT BEGIN UNTIL FEBRUARY 11, TWELVE DAYS AFTER THE ORDER, WHICH WAS NOT TIMELY AND IMMEDIATE COMPLIANCE AS DIRECTED. THE COURT OBSERVES THAT ALTHOUGH THE DEMENDARY STATEMPTS TO COMPLY WITH THE ORDER. THE DEFENDANT DID ATTEMPT TO COMPLY DID NOT BEGIN UNTIL FEBRUARY 11, TWELVE DAYS AFTER THE ORDER, WHICH WAS NOT TIMELY AND IMMEDIATE COMPLIANCE AS DIRECTED. THE COURT OBSERVES THAT ALTHOUGH THE EMAILS SENT TO VARIOUS WEBSITES BY THE FIRM'S PARALEGAL REPRESENTED A REASONABLE EFFORT TO COMPLY WITH THE ORDER, THE DEFENDANT HAS FROM THE INTERNET. THE COURT FINDS THAT THE DEFENDANT HAS ASIST HIM IN COMPLYING WITH THE DEFENDANT HAS INTERNET FOR OTHER ME	✓ CAPS	Close

Page 2 of 2

Case 15-01015 Doc 60

Document

Filed 02/20/15 Entered 02/20/15 17:26:02 Desc Main Page 2 of 2

SHALL FILE AN APPLICATION FOR COMPENSATION UNDER FED. R. BANKR. P. 2016 AND MLBR 2016-1.

Options • X			
Total Control	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT, DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS Proceeding Memorandum/Order of Court		
2292-	In Re: The Patriot Group, LLC v. Fustolo et Case Number: 15-01015 Ch:		
	MOVANT/APPLICANT/PARTIES: EVIDENTIARY HEARING:		
	#37 Motion of Plaintiff The Patriot Group, LLC For Contempt Re: [31] Memorandum Dated 1/30/2015; [32] Order dated 1/30/2015 for Preliminary Injunction (Gary Greenberg) #38 Affidavit of Kim Hopkins in Support of #37 (Gary Greenberg) #50 Opposition of Defendant Steven C. Fustolo to #37 (Matthew Horvitz)		
	OUTCOME:		
	37 Granted Denied Approved Sustained		
	DeniedDenied without prejudiceWithdrawn in open courtOverruled OSC enforced/released		
	Continued to: For:		
	Formal order/stipulation to be submitted by: Date due:		
	Findings and conclusions dictated at close of hearing incorporated by reference		
	Taken under advisement: Brief(s) dueFrom		
	Response(s) dueFrom		
	Fees allowed in the amount of: \$Expenses of: \$		
	No appearance/response by:		
	37 DECISION SET OUT MORE FULLY BY COURT AS FOLLOWS: □		